

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMIENT United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/697,734 7723

10/29/2003

Eugene Joseph Pancheri

9399

27752

CINCINNATI, OH 45224

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161 6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE

EXAMINER

O MALLEY, KATHRYN S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3749

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTOL-326 (Re		ion Summary	Par	t of Paper No./Mail Dat	e 050431
2) Notice 3) Inform Paper	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date 1/26/04, 3/5/04.	Pap 5) Noti	rview Summary (PT er No(s)/Mail Date. ce of Informal Pate er:	ΓΟ-413) ——— · nt Application (PTΟ-15	2)
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
	Inder 35 U.S.C. § 119		• • • • • • • •		
Application Papers 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 October 2003 is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) 1-13 and 16-23 is/are rejected. 7) ☑ Claim(s) 14 and 15 is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are pending in the application.					
Disposit	ion of Claims	x parte Quayle, 193	55 C.D. 11, 455	O.G. 213.	
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
2a)	==,== · · · · ·	action is non-final.			
1) 🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 M</u>	arch 2004.			
Status					
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ware to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however within the statutory minimu will apply and will expire SIX cause the application to be	may a reply be timel m of thirty (30) days v (6) MONTHS from the	y filed vill be considered timely. e mailing date of this comr (35 U.S.C. & 133)	nunication.
Pariod fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	, ,			ess
	•	Kathryn S. O'Malley		Art Unit	1 4
	Office Action Summary	10/697,734 Examiner		PANCHERI ET AL.	11/4
		Application No.		Applicant(s)	

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered claims 19-22 have been renumbered 20-23.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the benefit composition." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:
 - A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
 - (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. Claims 1-4, 8-12, 17-21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,980,583 to Staub et al.

Application/Control Number: 10/697,734 Page 3

Art Unit: 3749

6. Staub et al. teaches a fabric treatment device and method of its use comprising nozzle 52 in the door 18 of rotating drum 14 in thermal and fluidic communication, via conduit 70, with reservoir 60, which houses a wrinkle releaser to be sprayed onto fabric inside the drum 14 through nozzle 52 while drum 14 rotates. The apparatus further has heat sensors that provide cues to the user and has a cooling cycle. Note column 5, lines 1-63 and Figure 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claims 5 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Staub et al.
- 9. Staub et al. does not teach the specific thermal conductivity presently claimed. However, such a limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).
- 10. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Staub et al., as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Pletcher et al.

Application/Control Number: 10/697,734

Art Unit: 3749

composition of Pletcher et al.

11. Staub et al. does not teach electrically charging the benefit composition.

Page 4

Pletcher et al. teaches electrically charging a benefit composition that is sprayed onto fabric, wherein the composition can retain an electric charge for a sufficient time period for contacting the fabric, and means for grounding the device. Note column 1, lines 27-34. As Pletcher et al. teaches that electrically charging a benefit composition leads to greater attraction between the fabric and the composition and, therefore, more efficient treatment, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the fabric treatment method and apparatus of Staub et al. with the electrically charged

- 12. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Staub et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Furgal et al.
- 13. Staub et al., does not teach instructions for use. Furgal et al. teaches a similar fabric treatment apparatus comprising instructions. Note column 4, lines 37-44. As Furgal et al. teaches that instructions will enable a user to effectively use a fabric treatment device, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the fabric treatment apparatus of Staub et al. with the instructions of Furgal et al.

Allowable Subject Matter

14. Claims 14 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 3749

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Moser, Evans et al, and McCarty et al. teach similar fabric treatment methods and apparatus.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kathryn S. O'Malley whose telephone number is (703)308-2844. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ira Lazarus can be reached on (703)308-1935. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KSO

Supervisory Patent Examiner